



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/878,498	06/11/2001	Jeffrey A. McKelvey	01SW102	3072

7590 03/26/2004

Alexander M. Gerasimow
Rockwell Automation (Allen-Bradley Co., Inc.)
1201 South Second Street
Milwaukee, WI 53204

EXAMINER

GOLINKOFF, JORDAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

2

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/878,498

Applicant(s)

MCKELVEY ET AL.

Examiner

Jordan S Golinkoff

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- page 8, line 10 – “optimalset” should be changed to “optimal set”.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9, 21-22, 24-25, 27, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hammack et al. (“Hammack,” US006449624B1).

As per independent claim 1, Hammack teaches a graphical compare utility system for displaying control programs for industrial control modules (column 1, lines 36-50 and column 25, lines 8-12, *a graphical comparison user interface to compare instruction sets*), the system comprising: a conversion system operable to receive a first and a second control program and convert the first and second control program into a first and second data set representing individual instruction of the first and second control program (column 21, lines 33-41, *i.e. – translation*); and a viewing system operable to accept the first and second data sets and provide a graphical view of the first and second control programs in a single view based on the first and second binary data sets (column 24, lines 19-25).

Claim 21 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Hammack teaches that the graphical utility system providing indicators for insertions, deletions, modifications and moves of individual instructions between the first and the second control program (column 24, lines 35-52).

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Hammack teaches a difference module operable to determine differences between the first and the second control programs and provide a difference data structure representing the differences between the first and second control program (column 21, lines 60-65, *data defining differences is stored*).

Claim 24 is similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Hammack teaches a comparison module operable to receive the difference data structure and the first and second control programs and generate a plurality of comparison scenarios to provide a plurality of comparison set views (column 24, lines 5-18, *a plurality of views can be generated*, and column 25, lines 37-40).

Claim 25 is similar in scope to claim 6, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Hammack teaches a decision model operable to determine an optimal display set view from the plurality of comparison set views (column 23, lines 57-60, *the optimal view is determined based on the graphical or textual nature of the comparison data*, and column 25, lines 37-40).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, Hammack teaches the decision model transmitting the optimal display set view to a viewing component, the viewing component mapping the optimal display set view to graphic components associated with an operating

Art Unit: 2174

system, such that the optimal display set view can be provided to a display system for providing a graphical representation of the first and second control program in a single view (column 24, lines 10-13).

Claim 27 is similar in scope to claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per independent claim 30, Hammack teaches a system for displaying graphical representations of two control programs for industrial control modules in an adjacent configuration (column 1, lines 36-50 and column 25, lines 8-12, *a graphical comparison user interface to compare instruction sets*), the system comprising: means for converting the first and second control program into a first and second data set representing individual instructions of the first and second control program (column 21, lines 33-41, *i.e. – translation*); means for determining the differences between the first and second control program based on the first and second data sets (column 21, lines 60-65, *data defining differences is stored*); means for determining an optimal display set view based on the differences between the first and second control program (column 23, lines 57-60, *the optimal view is determined based on the graphical or textual nature of the comparison data*, and column 25, lines 37-40); and means for displaying the optimal display set view as a graphical view of the first and second control program, the means for displaying the optimal display set view providing indicators in the graphical view representing differences between the first and second control program (column 24, lines 10-13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2174

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-4, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammack et al. ("Hammack," US006449624B1) in further view of Schultz et al. ("Schultz," US005812133A).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, the teachings of Hammock in regards to claim 1 have been discussed above. Hammock does not explicitly disclose that the first and second control programs being a first ladder logic program and a second ladder logic program. However, Hammock does disclose a means to graphically compare control programs using blocks and lines that represent the sequential input and output of data to control devices (column 1, lines 36-50).

Schultz teaches that the first and second control programs being a first ladder logic program and a second ladder logic program (column 1, lines 21-25 and column 16, lines 13-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hammock with a means to specifically display ladder logic control programs, as taught by Schultz, with a motivation to provide an intuitive and simple way to analyze the operation of ladder logic control programs (columns 2-3, lines 65-3).

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Schultz teaches the individual instruction being rungs of the first and second ladder logic programs (column 16, lines 13-19).

Art Unit: 2174

5. Claims 10, 12, 28, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammack et al. ("Hammack," US006449624B1) in view of Microsoft Notepad ("MS Notepad," pages 1-2).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, the teachings of Hammock in regards to claim 1 have been discussed above. Hammock does not disclose a recursion tool to provide wrapping of the graphical view of the first and second control program, such that instructions of the control programs are wrapped in corresponding panes of a single frame window to avoid clipping of the instructions.

MS Notepad teaches wrapping of information to avoid the clipping of information (figures 2-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hammack with a means to wrap the control programs so as to avoid the clipping of instructions with the motivation to allow the viewer to see all information without needing to scroll the window.

Claims 28 and 31 are similar in scope to claim 10, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 10, MS Notepad teaches the recursion tool having an enabled state and a disabled state (figure 3, *enable or disable text wrapping*).

6. Claims 11 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammack et al. ("Hammack," US006449624B1) in view of Microsoft Notepad ("MS Notepad," Pages 1-2) as applied to claims 10 and 20, and further in view of Microsoft Word ("MS Word," pages 1-2).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, the teachings of the combination of Hammack and MS Notepad in regards to claim 10 have been discussed above. The combination of Hammack and MS Notepad does not disclose that the recursion tool is coupled to window resizing and zooming features of the graphical compare utility system, such that the graphical view of the first and second control programs is dynamically adjusted when at least one of window resizing and zooming is invoked.

MS Word teaches that the recursion tool being coupled to window resizing and zooming features of the graphical compare utility system, such that the graphical view of the first and second control programs is dynamically adjusted when at least one of window resizing and zooming is invoked (figures 2-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the combination of Hammack and MS Notepad with a means to dynamically adjust window resizing and zooming, as taught by MS Word, with the motivation to provide the optimal view in relation to the viewable space of the display region.

Claim 29 is similar in scope to claim 11, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammack et al. ("Hammack," US006449624B1) in view of Microsoft Notepad ("MS Notepad," pages 1-2) as applied to claim 10, and further in view of SnagIt Version 5.0 ("SnagIt," distributed by TechSmith Corporation, www.techsmith.com).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 10, the teachings of the combination of Hammack and MS Notepad in regards to claim 10 have been discussed above. The combination

Art Unit: 2174

of Hammack and MS Notepad does not disclose the recursion tool being operable to provide a printout of the graphical view of the first and second control program.

SnagIt teaches a tool being operable to provide a printout of the graphical view of the first and second control program (page 1, §Capture Destinations, *any screen can be captured and sent to the printer for printing*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the combination of Hammack and Ms Notepad with a means to print the graphical view of the control programs, as taught by SnagIt, with the motivation to allow the user to view, check, and save hard copies of the control programs.

8. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammack et al. ("Hammack," US006449624B1) in view of Schultz et al. ("Schultz," US005812133A).

As per independent claim 14, Hammack teaches a graphical utility system for displaying two control programs for industrial control modules in an adjacent configuration (column 25, lines 8-12, *a graphical comparison user interface to compare instruction sets*, and column 1, lines 36-50, *i.e. – a sequential follow chart having a series of interconnected blocks representative of input and output relationships*), the system comprising: a conversion system operable to receive a first and a second control program and convert the first and second control program into a first and second binary data set representing individual rungs of the first and second control program (column 21, lines 33-41, *i.e. – translation*); a difference module for determining differences between the first and the second binary data set and providing a difference data structure representing the differences between the first and second control

Art Unit: 2174

programs (column 21, lines 60-65, *data defining differences is stored*); a comparison module operable to receive the difference data structure and the first and second control programs and generate a plurality of comparison scenarios to provide a plurality of comparison set views (column 24, lines 5-18, *a plurality of views can be generated*, and column 25, lines 37-40); a decision model operable to determine an optimal display set view from the plurality of comparison set views (column 23, lines 57-60, *the optimal view is determined based on the graphical or textual nature of the comparison data*, and column 25, lines 37-40); and a viewing system operable to accept the optimal display set view and provide a graphical view of the first and second control programs in an adjacent configuration (column 24, lines 10-13).

Hammock does not explicitly disclose that the control programs being compared are ladder logic programs. Schultz teaches that it is known to display ladder logic programs so as to manipulate and update them (column 1, lines 21-25 and column 16, lines 13-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hammock with a means to specifically display ladder logic control programs, as taught by Schultz, with a motivation to provide an intuitive and simple way to analyze the operation of ladder logic control programs (columns 2-3, lines 65-3).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, Hammock teaches that the graphical utility system providing indicators for insertions, deletions, modifications and moves of individual rungs between the first and the second ladder logic control program (column 24, lines 35-52).

9. Claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammack et al. ("Hammack," US006449624B1) in view of Schultz et al. ("Schultz,"

Art Unit: 2174

US005812133A) as applied to claim 14, and further in view of Microsoft Notepad ("MS Notepad," pages 1-2).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 14, the teachings of the combination of Hammock and Schultz in regards to claim 14 have been discussed above. The combination of Hammock and Schultz does not disclose a recursion tool to provide wrapping of the graphical view of the first and second control program, such that instructions of the control programs are wrapped in corresponding panes of a single frame window to avoid clipping of the instructions.

MS Notepad teaches wrapping of information to avoid the clipping of information (figures 2-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the combination of Hammock and Schultz with a means to wrap the control programs so as to avoid the clipping of instructions with the motivation to allow the viewer to see all information without needing to scroll the window.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 17, MS Notepad teaches the recursion tool having an enabled state and a disabled state (figures 3, *enable or disable text wrapping*).

10. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammack et al. ("Hammack," US006449624B1) in view of Schultz et al. ("Schultz," US005812133A) further in view of Microsoft Notepad ("MS Notepad," Pages 1-2) as applied to claim 17, and further in view of Microsoft Word ("MS Word," Pages 1-2).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 17, the teachings of the combination of Hammack, Schultz, and MS Notepad in regards to claim 17 have been discussed above. The combination of Hammack, Schultz, and MS Notepad does not disclose that the recursion tool is coupled to window resizing and zooming features of the graphical compare utility system, such

Art Unit: 2174

that the graphical view of the first and second control programs is dynamically adjusted when at least one of window resizing and zooming is invoked.

MS Word teaches that the recursion tool being coupled to window resizing and zooming features of the graphical compare utility system, such that the graphical view of the first and second control programs is dynamically adjusted when at least one of window resizing and zooming is invoked (figures 2-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the combination of Hammack, Schultz, and MS Notepad with a means to dynamically adjust window resizing and zooming, as taught by MS Word, with the motivation to provide the optimal view in relation to the viewable space of the display region.

11. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammack et al. ("Hammack," US006449624B1) in view of Schultz et al. ("Schultz," US005812133A) further in view of Microsoft Notepad ("MS Notepad," pages 1-2) as applied to claim 17, and further in view of SnagIt Version 5.0 ("SnagIt," distributed by TechSmith Corporation, www.techsmith.com).

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 17, the teachings of the combination of Hammack, Schultz, and MS Notepad in regards to claim 17 have been discussed above. the combination of Hammack, Schultz, and MS Notepad does not disclose the recursion tool being operable to provide a printout of the graphical view of the first and second control program.

SnagIt teaches a tool being operable to provide a printout of the graphical view of the first and second control program (page 1, §Capture Destinations, *any screen can be captured and sent to the printer for printing*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 2174

the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the combination of Hammack, Schultz, and MS Notepad with a means to print the graphical view of the control programs, as taught by SnagIt, with the motivation to allow the user to view, check, and save hard copies of the control programs.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 8, 16, and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art does not teach choosing two documents to compare based on maximizing the number of instruction matches between documents wherein the instructions are programming instructions.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Both Hughes (US006275223B1) and Percival et al. (US006226652B1) teach a utility to compare instructions between programs.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jordan S Golinkoff whose telephone number is 703-305-8771.

Art Unit: 2174

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jordan Golinkoff
Patent Examiner
March 11, 2004

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100